

**From:** [POULSEN Mike](#)  
**To:** [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Cc:** [Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [PETERSON Jenn L](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Presentation of Data  
**Date:** 01/15/2008 08:11 AM

---

Eric -

I don't follow what the question/issue is here. Are you looking to limit the number of figures in the RI/RA, and focus on chemicals showing risk? Generally we can get a good handle on risk by seeing the exceedances of screening levels. But there are other factors that are considered in the final risk evaluation. Is there a specific comment on the Round 2 Report that you are referring to?

- Mike

-----Original Message-----

From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov  
[mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]  
Sent: Monday, January 14, 2008 11:27 PM ???  
To: Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov; Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov; POULSEN  
Mike  
Subject: Presentation of Data  
Importance: High

In the Round 2 Report, I believe that we wanted data presented relative to PRGs (screening levels) for the purpose of identifying data gaps. While this may be useful for data gap identification since we presumably do not know what chemicals are contributing most to risk, I wonder if this is appropriate for the draft RI Report. A lot of chemicals screen in. I would rather the data presentation (i.e., indicator chemicals) focus on chemicals that were identified as presenting risk based on the BRA.

Just asking for a reality check here - is this ok? I think it is cleaner.

Thanks, Eric